

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/521,114	HOFMANN ET AL.
	Examiner Rodney B. White	Art Unit 3636

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rodney B. White. (3) _____.

(2) Daniel R. Kimbell (#34,849). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 March 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Blasin (U.S. Patent No 4,368,916).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



RODNEY B. WHITE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed clarifying the 112/2nd problems in claim 1 as noted in the office action mailed 01/12/2007 and it was proposed to amend the claim so that it reads " wherein each lever has a first and second end, wherein each lever is attached on the first end to a support plate displaceable together with the backrest, and on the other end is adapted to attach to a floor unit of a motor vehicle" and to delete the unclear language of claim 1. it was also agreed that the limitations added to claim 1 rendered the claim patentably distinct over the Blasin patent. The proposed Examiner's Amendment was agreed upon and entered as such..